

cu



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,930	03/13/2002	Michael R. Klardie	14484	2702

25763 7590 12/15/2004

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498

EXAMINER

BUMGARNER, MELBA N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/099,930

Applicant(s)

KLARDIE ET AL.

Examiner

Melba Bumgarner

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26,28-30,35,37-75 and 77-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 43,52,64,66 and 67 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23,25,28-30,44,45,47-51,53-58,62,63,65,68-75,77-79 and 86-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24,26,35,37-42,46,59-61 and 81-85 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 1-26, 28-30, 35, 37-43, 46, 59, 80, and 87 are objected to because of the following informalities: preamble of claims dependent upon claims 1, 24, and 35 needs correction, claims 1, 24, 35, and 43 “the” should read —A—, claims 24, 26, 35, 46, 56, 80, and 87 contain recitations of insufficient antecedent basis and errors in the claimed language that need correction as in previous office action. Applicant is asked to review claims carefully, for example, claim 24 omitted “a flat surface”. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not describe “the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming a substantially closed inner cavity”, in that the opening is used to engage the abutment piece.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3732

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hurson (2002/0106610). Hurson discloses a combination comprising a dental implant having a outer circumferential collar 42, and an impression cap 120 comprising an elongate body 122 having a longitudinal axis 164, a first end 126 and a second end 124, at least the second end being provided with an opening, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming a inner cavity 130, a press fit mechanism comprising a press fit surface formed in the second end of the body, figure 7D, the circumferential collar having an outer diameter, the implant having a longitudinal axis, a top and a bottom, the press fit surface being an internal surface with internal sidewall generally parallel to the axis of the implant when the implant and cap are connected. As to claim 2, an inner circumferential angled surface is located at the second end of the body and having a size and shape complementary to an outer upper shoulder of the circumferential collar of the implant as seen in figure 8A. As to claim 3, the press fit mechanism comprises a circumferential flange extending downward from the body, the flange having an inner squeezing surface (figure 8B). As to claim 4, the press fit mechanism further comprises a curved relief 136 between the inner circumferential angled surface and the inner squeezing surface, the relief forming a gap between the impression cap and the implant when the impression cap is positioned on the implant. As to claims 5 and 6, the flange further

Art Unit: 3732

comprises a tapered surface, the tapered surface extending downward from the squeezing surface and away from the implant. As to claims 7 and 8, the flange having a bottom end, the flange further comprising an outer angled surface, the outer angled surface extending downward and inward to the bottom end of the flange. As to claim 11, the body is generally conical at 124. As to claim 13, the impression cap has a vent positioned at the first end of the cap. As to claims 16 and 17, the impression cap being elastic [0088] line 4. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the impression cap. As to claim 19, the body comprises a side wall having an outer surface and at least one circumferential rib protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall 166.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halldin et al. (2003/0082499). Halldin et al. disclose a combination comprising a dental implant having a outer circumferential collar, and an impression cap 201 comprising an elongate body 203 having a longitudinal axis 164, a side wall, a first end 126 and a second end 124, at least the second end being provided with an opening, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming an inner cavity 130, a press fit mechanism 209 comprising a press fit surface formed in the second end of the body, figure 7d, the circumferential collar having an outer diameter, figure 8a, the implant having a longitudinal axis, a top and a bottom, the press fit surface being an internal surface with internal sidewall generally parallel to the axis of the implant when the implant and cap are connected. As to claim 2, an inner circumferential angled surface is located at the second end of the body and having a size and shape complementary to an outer upper shoulder of the circumferential collar of the dental implant. As to claim 3, the press fit mechanism comprises a circumferential flange

Art Unit: 3732

extending downward from the body, the flange having an inner squeezing surface. As to claim 5, the flange further comprises a tapered surface, the tapered surface extending downward from the squeezing surface and away from the implant. As to claim 7, the flange having a bottom end, the flange further comprising an outer angled surface, the outer angled surface extending downward and inward to the bottom end of the flange. As to claim 9, the body having an inner surface wall, the inner circumferential angled surface angling outward from the inner surface wall, wherein a channel is formed in the inner circumferential angled surface (figure 7b), such that a vent from the cavity to the outside is formed when the impression cap is positioned on the implant. As to claim 10, there are at least two channels formed. As to claims 13 and 14, the impression cap has a vent 217 positioned at the first end of the cap. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the vent. As to claims 16 and 17, the implant includes an implant table, the impression cap being elastic [0145] line 3. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the impression cap. As to claim 19, the body comprises a side wall having an outer surface and at least one circumferential rib protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall 242. As to claim 44, Halldin et al. show the impression cap comprising a first groove formed in the inner surface adjacent the second end, which has the capability to vent air (figure 7b). As to claim 47, the impression cap further comprises a second groove formed in the inner surface adjacent the second end having the capability to vent air. As to claim 48, the grooves are positioned in the inner surface in opposing fashion. As to claim 50, an abutment flat is formed in the inner surface. As to claim 68, the cylinder-shaped body has a generally conical inner cavity 243. As to claim 73, Halldin et al. show an external geometry formed on the outer surface. As to claim 74, the impression cap has a generally conical inner cavity (figure 8b).

Art Unit: 3732

7. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 16, 17, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grande et al. (6,068,478). Grande et al. disclose a combination comprising a dental implant having a outer circumferential collar, and an impression cap 4 comprising an elongate body 203 having a longitudinal axis 164, a first end 126 and a second end 124, at least the second end being provided with an opening, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming a inner cavity 40, a press fit mechanism 42 comprising a press fit surface formed in the second end of the body, figure 1E, the circumferential collar having an outer diameter, figure 8a, the implant having a longitudinal axis, a top and a bottom, the press fit surface being an internal surface with internal sidewall generally parallel to the axis of the implant when the implant and cap are connected. As to claim 2, an inner circumferential angled surface 21 is located at the second end of the body and having a size and shape complementary to an outer upper shoulder of the circumferential collar 11 of the dental implant. As to claim 3, the press fit mechanism comprises a circumferential flange extending downward from the body, the flange having an inner squeezing surface. As to claim 5, the flange further comprises a tapered surface, the tapered surface extending downward from the squeezing surface and away from the implant. As to claim 7, the flange having a bottom end, the flange further comprising an outer angled surface, the outer angled surface extending downward and inward to the bottom end of the flange. As to claims 16 and 17, the implant includes an implant table, the impression cap being elastic (column 4 line 40). Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the impression cap. As to claim 19, the body comprises a side wall having an outer surface and at least one circumferential rib 43 protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall. As to claim 20, the body comprises two circumferential ribs protruding outward from the outer surface

Art Unit: 3732

of the side wall, wherein the two circumferential ribs are spaced apart along the longitudinal axis of the cap. As to claim 21, at least one of the circumferential ribs has a flat surface. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the feature.

8. Claims 62, 63, 65, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hurson (6,672,871). Hurson discloses an impression cap 200 comprising an elongate body having a longitudinal axis, a side wall, a first end and a second end, at least the second end being provided with an opening to engage an abutment piece, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming an inner cavity, the body further having an inner surface 104 and an outer surface, the impression cap further comprising an abutment flat formed in the inner surface and a bulge 110 formed on the abutment flat which extends inward, the bulge is adjacent to the second end of the flat, as seen in figure 7A. As to claim 63, the cap further comprises an exterior geometry. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the geometry. As to claim 65, the first end of the cap is substantially closed forming a top. As to claim 69, the impression cap further comprises a press fit mechanism formed in the second end of the body 112.

9. Claims 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Phimmasone (5,934,906). Phimmasone discloses an impression cap 72 comprising an elongate body having a longitudinal axis, a side wall, a first end and a second end, at least the second end being provided with an opening, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming an inner cavity, the body further having an inner surface 74 and an outer surface 76, the impression cap further comprising an abutment flat formed in the inner surface and an indicator surface 82 formed on the outer surface, the indicator surface corresponds to and identifies the flat



Art Unit: 3732

(figure 8). As to claim 74, the cap has a generally conical inner cavity. As to claim 75, the outer surface is generally conical.

10. Claim 86 is rejected as understood, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter et al. (2001/0034008). Porter et al. disclose an impression cap 90 comprising an elongate body having a longitudinal axis, a first end and a second end, at least the second end being provided with an opening 96, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming a “substantially closed” inner cavity, the body having an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the first end is substantially closed forming a top 94, the tip comprising a vent, the vent comprising a vent opening 92 that is capable of being closed. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the opening.

11. Claims 87 and 88 are rejected as understood, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gentile et al. (6,161,729). Gentile et al. disclose a cap 38 comprising an elongate body having a longitudinal axis, a first end and a second end, at least the second end being provided with an opening, the opening extending longitudinally into the body from the second end forming an inner cavity, the body having an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the first end is substantially closed forming a top 44, the top comprising a vent, the vent comprising a slit and a cover 42 which is attached to the top of the first end. Patentable weight is not given to the intended use of the cap. As to claim 88, there are two slits formed in the top.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3732

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 11, 12, 15, 23, 25, 45, 49, 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halldin et al. Halldin et al. disclose an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the cylinder-shaped body being conical. It would be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the body being conical. The specific shaped is not disclosed as critical to the claimed invention, nor is a "conical" shape shown. As to claim 12, the inner cavity of the impression cap has an inner geometry which comprises an internal abutment flat 243 and has a size and shape complementary to an abutment piece which may be secured in the implant (figure 8b). As to claim 15, the impression cap has an external geometry 241, which references an external abutment feature. It would be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the intended use of the feature. As to claim 23, Halldin et al. show a first vertical rib protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall; however, they do not show the groove extending from the first end to the second end. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to one having ordinary skill in the art as to the length of the rib on the outer wall. The extension of the rib is not disclosed as critical to the claimed invention. As to claim 25, Halldin et al. show a second vertical rib, wherein the vertical ribs are spaced 180 degrees apart from one another around the periphery of the cap. As to claim 45, the first end of the cap forms a top, it would be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill the art as to size of the top being substantially closed. As to claim 58, Halldin et al. show a second vertical rib, the ribs spaced apart from one another around the periphery of the cap.

Art Unit: 3732

14. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halldin et al. in view of Porter et al. Halldin et al. disclose an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the impression cap being color coded. Porter et al. teach an impression cap color coded [0043] line 3. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the impression cap of Halldin et al. to be color coded. One would be motivated in order to use the color to indicate its size in view of Porter et al. Porter et al. also teach the corresponding components coded in the same color.

15. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grande et al. Grande et al. disclose an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the circumferential ribs comprising at least one concave surface around their periphery. Grande et al. show indented portions of the circumferential ribs. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the specific geometry (concave) of the indented portions. The specific shape is not disclosed as critical to the claimed invention.

16. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halldin et al. in view of Kumar (6,561,805) and further in view of Larson et al. (5,540,876). Halldin et al. disclose an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the cap gamma sterilized. Kumar discloses an impression cap (coping) sterilized (column 1 line 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to sterilize the cap as in Kumar. One would be motivated in order to have a sterile component before insertion into the patient's mouth and reduce chances for infection or

Art Unit: 3732

complications in view of Kumar. The modified impression cap of Halldin et al. and Kumar further does not show the cap gamma sterilized. Larson et al. teach gamma sterilization of materials including plastics and items of medical applications (column 2 lines 40, 65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to further modify the impression cap to be gamma sterilized. One would be motivated in order to be able to sterilize in bulk, to sterilize pre-packaged materials for easier handling, and to use a less expensive radiation process than electron radiation in view of Larson et al. As to claim 29, the impression cap of Halldin et al. is plastic [0145] line 2. As to claim 30, Halldin et al. shows the plastic material selected so as to provide sufficient elasticity to allow formation of the press fit mechanism but not being easily deformable to ensure proper use. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the specific type of plastic, since it is not disclosed as critical to the claimed invention.

17. Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halldin et al. in view of Grande et al. Halldin et al. disclose an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the body comprising two circumferential ribs. Grande et al. teach the body comprising two circumferential ribs protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall, wherein the two circumferential ribs are spaced apart along the longitudinal axis of the body. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the impression cap of Halldin et al. to have a second circumferential rib. One would be motivated in order to aid in anchoring the cap in the impression compound and prevent the displacement or twisting of the cap in view of Grande. As to claim 56, Grande et al. show indented portions of the circumferential ribs. It would have been

Art Unit: 3732

an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the specific geometry (concave) of the indented portions.

18. Claims 70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurson (6,672,871) in view of Halldin et al. Hurson discloses an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, Hurson does not show a first vertical rib protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall. Halldin et al. teach a vertical rib protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cap of Hurson to include a vertical rib. One would be motivated, as it appears from figures 7a and 7b, in order to have it function as structural support to the circumferential rib in the prolongation region of Halldin et al. and as such structural enhancements are known in the art. It would be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the length of the rib on the outer wall. As to claim 71, Halldin et al. show a second vertical rib, the ribs spaced apart from one another around the periphery of the cap. As to claim 72, Halldin et al. show the second vertical rib thickens at its bottom.

19. Claims 77-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phimmasone in view of Grande et al. Phimmasone discloses an impression cap that shows the limitations as described above; however, Phimmasone does not show the body comprising two circumferential ribs. Grande et al. teach the body comprising two circumferential ribs protruding outward from the outer surface of the side wall, wherein the two circumferential ribs are spaced apart along the longitudinal axis of the body. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the impression cap of Phimmasone

Art Unit: 3732

to have a second circumferential rib in order to aid in anchoring the cap in the impression compound and prevent the displacement or twisting of the cap in view of Grande et al. As to claim 78, Grande et al. show at least one of the circumferential ribs having a flat surface. As to claim 79, Grande et al. show indented portions of the circumferential ribs. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art as to the specific geometry (concave) of the indented portions.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

20. Claims 43, 52, 64, 66, and 67 are allowed.

21. At least claims 24, 26, 35, 46, and 59 have objections and would be allowable if corrected.

*Response to Arguments*

22. Applicant's arguments filed September 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The prior art show the structural imitations of the rejected claims. The limitation of a press fit mechanism including an internal press fit surface is broad. The claimed invention also describes the press fit mechanism comprising a circumferential flange having an inner squeezing surface. These are believed to be shown in the prior art. In response to the applicant's argument that the purpose(s) of the features of the prior art is different from the claimed invention, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Art Unit: 3732

23. It is also noted that the applicant should file amendment(s) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121.

*Conclusion*

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melba Bumgarner whose telephone number is 571-272-4709. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached at 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melba Bumgarner  
Patent Examiner